

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/731,674	Applicant(s) LENEHAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Ljiljana (Lil) V. Ciric	Art Unit 3744	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ljiljana (Lil) V. Ciric. (3) ____.

(2) Thomas B. Haverstock, Reg. No. 32,571. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 20 February 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 38-40, 42, 49, 50 and 108-111.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner Ciric telephoned Attorney Haverstock to discuss the IDS filed on 12 December 2008 and late matched with the allowed file as well as to propose a supplemental examiner's amendment to perfect base claim 110. Attorney Haverstock approved the proposed examiner's amendment (copy attached).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Ljiljana (Lil) V. Ciric/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3744	
--	--